

Con

Comp'd. by D. Paterson

ANIMADVERSIONS

UPON THE

REV. JOHN ROAF'S

TWO SERMONS ON BAPTISM.

BY

JAMES PYPER,

PASTOR OF THE BOND STREET BAPTIST CHURCH, TORONTO.

TORONTO:

PRINTED BY CARTER & THOMAS, 45, YONGE STREET.

1851.

1851
(10)

NOTE.—It will be seen, in the following pages, that I have used the phrase
“infant *baptism*,” in its popular sense.

ANIMADVERSIONS.

I propose, in the following pages, to examine "Two Sermons on Baptism," by the Rev. John Roaf, pastor of the Adelaide Street Congregational Church, Toronto. These discourses were originally delivered by Mr. Roaf to his own people, and are now given, in printed form, to the world. They have thus become public property, and may, without even seeming to interfere with the pastor in the conscientious discharge of his duties to his flock, be subjected to the ordeal of a legitimate criticism.

The ordinance of baptism has long been a bone of contention amongst God's people; and when, or how this much-agitated question will be put to rest, it is difficult to foresee. One thing, however, I believe to be certain, namely, that enlightened discussion cannot fail to facilitate the accomplishment of this object. Taking this view of the subject, I am glad that Mr. Roaf has published these sermons. I have read them with care, and, I believe, with candour: still I am constrained to believe that the arguments offered by Mr. R. (which, by the way, are, for the most part, but an echo of Wardlaw, Taylor, Ewing, and others,) fall very far short of sustaining his positions.

The world has been so long under the domination of creeds and formulas, and confessions of faith, that the language of those human productions has become so thoroughly blended with the language of the Bible, and the sentiments which they inculcate, even the most erroneous, have become so incorporated in the minds of men with Bible sentiment, Bible thought, and Bible association, that it has become difficult to separate them; and hence it is, that good men urge dogmas with confidence, as doctrines of the Bible, which, after all, are but the teachings of some confession of faith. We have evidence of the truth of this statement in the first sentence which Mr. Roaf pens. He says "It (baptism) exhibits God's covenant in which we are all interested." I do not complain here that the *phraseology* is unscriptural,—my complaint is, that the idea sought to be conveyed is at variance with the teachings of inspiration. Baptism, exhibits no covenant, human or Divine. In controversy, especially, such statements should be avoided or proved.

Mr. Roaf, in his first sermon, discusses—First, "THE DIVINE AUTHORITY FOR ADMITTING CHILDREN TO BAPTISM;" and, Second, "THE IMPORT OF IT WHEN THUS APPLIED." In his exordium he says:—

"There are parties who doubt whether children are admissible for baptism. Now, the question between them and the rest of the Christian world, is not, whe-

ther children or adults are to be baptised, not whether infants or believers, but it is whether infants, as well as their believing parents, ought not to be baptized. Those who baptise children, baptise also adults."

On this I remark,

1. That our opposition to infant baptism does not grow out of doubts which we entertain, as Mr. R. supposes, as to the admissibility of infants to baptism, but out of a *firm conviction* that the practice is unscriptural.

2. The question between Baptists and Pedobaptists relates as distinctly to believers, as it does to infants.

Mr. R. seems to admit that believers ought to be baptised; yet it is only *seeming*, for our author regards a solemn invitation given to penitent believers to do just what the Redeemer enjoins upon believers, as a "*temptation*," which he trusts will never lead those sprinkled in infancy, "to repudiate;" something which he calls "this grace of our covenant God." Here then we find an issue of a most important character between our brethren and ourselves. We plead for the baptism of believers. Their system carried out, would banish such baptism from the earth. Christ has made it obligatory on every one who hears the gospel, whether sprinkled in infancy or not, to believe, to become disciples; and it is His command that such should be baptised. *He has made no exceptions.* By what authority, then, does Mr. R. act in excepting himself, and nearly all his people? He cannot plead the law of circumcision in extenuation of this dereliction from the path indicated by positive enactment; for many of those who had been circumcised in infancy, were, in the days of the Apostles, and by their authority, baptized upon a profession of their faith. No one becoming a disciple, was excused in those days on the plea of having received the "Seal of the Covenant" why should they be so now? Convince me that infant baptism is divinely appointed and I will practise it, but never at the expense of a law which no power under God can abrogate. It is one of the evils connected with infant baptism that it annihilates believer's baptism. It is a tradition which makes void the law of God.

Mr. R. says, (p. 4.) "True, faith preceded scripture baptisms, but that faith led to the baptism of households." This is precisely what we contend for, and I ask, if faith on the part of the subject preceded *scripture* baptisms, what kind of baptism is that which faith does not precede? Faith "led to the baptism of households;" but in order to sustain his views, Mr. R. must prove that *blood*, as well as faith, led to such baptism. But Mr. R. informs us, "that the order in which matters are *stated* or *described* is not a proof of their having *taken place* in the same order." A protestant minister using such a subterfuge! how strange! Because some matters are mentioned in scripture without any reference to the order of the occurrence, are we to infer from this fact that we are at liberty to baptise other subjects than those which the law commands to be baptised. Does Mr. R. believe that the commission allowed the Apostles, first, to baptise

the worshippers of Jupiter, and afterwards disciple them? The Jesuits have acted upon this principle, and have baptised thousands of untutored and unsanctified savages. A man must examine himself and be able to discern the Lord's body in order to partake of the ordinance of the supper *scripturally*. But if this principle be correct, infants, and ungodly adults may be worthy communicants! With such a principle I will undertake to upset the entire order of Christ's house. It is a peculiar infelicity of error that its advocates can never long be consistent with themselves. Mr. R. subverts his own principle on the same page on which he attempts its defence. He says, "but admitting, *as we do*, that faith and repentance did precede baptism," &c. How did Mr. R. discover this order? Just as other men discover it; here his common sense triumphed over his theory.

"The question," says Mr. R., "is, did not the faith of such as were parents, lead to the baptism of themselves and their young children?" I reply never, in *any* dispensation. Even circumcision was not administered on account of parental faith, but on the ground of blood relationship. But Mr. R. says, "under the Mosaic administration the heathen were to be admitted to the Church of God upon their faith and repentance; but this admission included the individuals and their children." On this I remark:—

1. Faith and repentance were always essential to salvation; but that faith and repentance were essential to a standing in the "Commonwealth of Israel" is an idea that few men would be willing to endorse. Did the Shechemites repent and believe before they were circumcised? Can the law, referring to aliens, be made, even by implication, to require faith and repentance? Certainly not. That law entitled all strangers who sojourned amongst the children of Israel and who were willing to keep the passover together with their children *old and young* to all the privileges of that church, as enjoyed by "home-born" subjects. Ex. xii: 48, 49. Will Mr. R., will any man in his senses, affirm that such is the law of admission into the Christian Church? If so, where will it lead him? He must baptise adults and infants on the simple willingness of their parents to walk with God's people. But he cannot stop here: he must go on, and extend to such children all the privileges of the house of God. Nor can he stop here: those privileges must be extended to their children's children, not by regeneration, but "in their generations" to the end of time. If this is God's law of admission, we cannot observe a part, and reject a part; the *whole law* must be carried out. With Christ's law in our hands can such ideas require a formal refutation?

2. Mr. R. ought not to *assume* that such is the law of admission into the Christian Church; honest enquirers will ask him for *proof* of the fact, and here he must fail.

The law of Christ is certainly plain enough on this subject, *Disciples*, or *believers* are to be baptised. Is an infant a disciple or believer? But Mr. R. says, (and what Pedobaptist has not said it) "if because a child cannot believe, he is excluded from baptism, he must, also,

because he cannot believe, be excluded from heaven;" supposing we try this principle with reference to the Lord's Supper. The law requires, that the worthy communicant "examine himself" and that he be able to "discern the Lord's body." Is an infant capable of doing this? But a Greek would say, with equal propriety here, as in regard to baptism, "if because a child cannot examine itself, nor discern the Lord's body he is *excluded* from the privileges of the Church below, he must also, because he cannot examine himself and discern the Lord's body be *excluded* from heaven!" If *faith* is as essential to entering heaven, as it is to entering the church of Christ on earth, then I contend that no infant, idiot, or heathen *can* be saved. Infants can be saved by the atonement of Christ without the gospel—but by the gospel, or "good news," they *cannot* be saved. The gospel saves none without personal faith, and it authorises the baptism of none without like faith. If it does, produce the law, and I will bow to such authority.

"To say," continues Mr. R., "that because a child does not come to this observance intelligently, he is unfit for it, is to raise an objection to the ancient circumcising of infants, for they then were as disqualified to receive the initiatory church ordinance as now." I must be allowed to deprecate this wholesale *assumption* of premises so utterly untenable.

1. Mr. R. here *assumes* that the law of circumcision and the law of baptism are identical. Now, what are the facts in the case. The law of circumcision was: "He that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations: he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger which is not of thy seed: he that is born in thy house, and he that is bought of thy money must needs be circumcised."—Gen. xvii. 12, 13. The law of Christian baptism is: "Go disciple all nations baptising them; preach the gospel to every creature, he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved." How is it possible for prejudice itself to confound these two laws? In the one, we have, as the only prerequisite to its observance, *blood and property*; in the other *faith*. In the one, unconsciousness is accepted; in the other, sanctified intelligence. The one embraces *male* infants and slaves; the other only the disciples of Christ, those that the Lord has made free, whether male or female. Children were *commanded* to be brought to the one; the very terms of the other exclude them. When we deny a child's fitness then for baptism, we do not "raise an objection to the ancient circumcising of infants;" *male* children possessed the requisite qualifications for the rite. But do male and female infants possess the divinely appointed qualifications for baptism? Not ONE of these qualifications. To baptise infants then, and slaves is to act not merely without law, but contrary to law.

2. Why does Mr. R. object to the unbelieving children of believers, and to their children's children, "in their generations" being made partakers of *all* the privileges of the church of Christ? Does he not "raise an objection to the ancient" practice of what *he* calls the church

of God? Were not unbelievers "quite as disqualified" for church ordinances then as they are now? Is not the gospel an extension, rather than a diminution of privileges? Can Mr. R. defend his practice, in this respect?

Mr. R. says, (p. 5.) "it is also often objected, that a child can get no benefit from baptism; but it may be replied, that though an infant knows nothing of a legacy which is left him, yet it will in due time do him good service; and though he may, at the moment of baptism, not be the better for it, yet he may afterwards." Had I found the above sentiment in an Oxford Tract, I could have deciphered its meaning: as it is, I confess myself puzzled. I know what a legacy is, I can also understand how "in due time" it can benefit its subject; but what legacy is secured to a child by its baptism, and how it is to be enriched by it "in due time," I wot not. Is it regeneration that is secured to the child, "this grace of the covenant God"? What is it? Mr. R. compares it to a legacy! Is there accuracy in the comparison? If so, Mr. R. teaches by a circumlocution what the Bishop of Exeter teaches directly. So teaches Dr. Pusey, and the council of Trent confirms the whole.

Mr. R. says, (p. 6.) "some persons think it an objection to the baptism of children, that when Christ was an infant he was not baptised." I never urge this as an objection. But did not Christ receive the "seal of the covenant" in infancy, and was he not afterwards baptised?

Mr. R. makes Baptists to say, "we have no express command for baptising children." This is *not* what we say. We affirm that there is no command for it of any kind, *express* or *implicit*. No example, such as we have for the observance of the first day of the week, or female communion; no legitimate inference from relevant facts. We give our brethren the whole field. Let them prove "by any means," that a rite not *once* mentioned in the word of God is, nevertheless, there, and we will yield the point. What more can they ask?

Mr. R. next advances to his "positive proofs," and says: "The non-restriction of the ordinance to adults, in the original appointment of it by the Lord, shews that as infants would *necessarily* be understood to be appointed recipients, they were *intended* to be such."

1. The term *adults* is unscriptural, believing children are as proper subjects of baptism as believing adults. Had Mr. R. said, the non-restriction of the ordinance to *disciples* or *believers*, it would have been too glaring a contradiction of the "original appointment" to have escaped detection.

2. What does he mean by non-restriction? Is not the command to baptise *disciples* or *believers*, as pointed a restriction as human language can possibly indicate? Is the Lord's table any better guarded? The restriction is *positive*, and weighty as the authority of Him, who will soon judge the quick and the dead, can make it.

2. How would infants "*necessarily* be understood to be appointed recipients?" Are they *disciples* or *believers*? If not, they would "*necessarily* be understood" to be excluded. No logic nor sophistry

on earth can foist unconscious infants or slaves into *this* law. The law of their baptism, if it exists, must be sought for elsewhere.

But Mr. R. informs us that "our Lord's hearers were all Jews;" "that they had been accustomed to see Gentiles and Gentile children admitted to the church by circumcision," and that the right of the children was never amongst them disputed." To all which I reply: that the "Jew's religion" and the Christian religion, differed too widely to admit of being regarded as the same church. *They stood on different covenants:* the one was national; the other, universal. *They had different Mediators:* the one had Moses; while the Mediator of those belonging to the "better covenant established on better promises" was Christ. *They had totally different subjects:* the one embraced the children of the flesh; the other only the children of the Spirit. To be born of a Jew or a Proselyte, entitled *male* children not to circumcision merely, but to *all* the privileges of the Jewish church or theocracy. To be entitled to *any* or *all* of the privileges of the church of Christ, parents, children, and slaves "must be born again." While then, the rights of the children of the flesh, to *all* the privileges of the Jewish church, could not be "disputed," it is clear as the sun in the heavens, that their title to Christian ordinances, rested upon their being not *young* creatures, but *new* creatures. Mr. R. asks, "had Christ been appointing the admission of the nations by *circumcision*, instead of *baptism*, how would he have been understood." I reply, he could only have been understood to have *meant* what he *said*. Had the command been to circumcise *disciples* or *believers*, to have circumcised any others by such a law, would have been to have violated its precept. Baptism, however, and not circumcision, is commanded.

Mr. R. continues: "no change from the long established course would have been understood other than was expressed." Very well, what *change* was *expressed*? A change from *blood* to *faith*; from ordinary generation flowing on and on, to regeneration untransferable.

But, asks Mr. R., (p. 8.) "would they not have seen, that if Christ meant to exclude any of the parties who were accustomed to be received upon conversion, he would have named them, and pointedly drawn attention to the new arrangement?" On this I remark:

1. That the parties referred to by Mr. R., were not necessarily converted, (if by conversion he means regeneration.)

2. But granting that they were; to *what* were those parties received? Not to circumcision merely, but to *all* the privileges of the Jewish Church. Is this Mr. R.'s law? *Who* were the parties received to circumcision and to those privileges? The natural *male* descendants of Abraham, together with proselytes and their natural *male* descendants and slaves. Is this Mr. R.'s law? Now this law, we are told, included children. If it did, it would be nothing to the purpose, for it is not the law of Christ's house. But I call special attention to a sophism, which I have found in nearly all pedobaptist works on this

point. Men assume that the bare command to circumcise parents, included their children. This is contrary to fact. The idea that the term parent covered the whole ground, and expressed child as well as parent, is sheer fiction. Children were not included in a general command given to parents, but on the contrary, were specifically named, and directions given for their circumcision. When the stranger is commanded to be circumcised, it is not in pedobaptist style, taken for granted that his *males* would be "*necessarily understood*," but a specific command is given for their circumcision. When Christ then gave a law demanding of old and young discipleship, or faith, in order to the privileges of his house, he "pointedly drew attention" to this arrangement.

Mr. R. intimates, (p. 8.) that, "the old statute was not repealed." Why then does he not act upon it? A knife, not a basin, is his instrument. Where is his authority for substituting baptism for circumcision? Where is his authority for baptising *female* infants; why does he exclude slaves; and why, under a system of "expanded liberality," does he deprive children, and children's children, in their generations, of their rights in the church? Not repealed! Is the law of slavery, *formally* repealed? Is the law which made the children of the priest's *priests*, formally repealed? "The advocates for punishing peaceable *heretics* and idolators," says Dr. Paul, "find in Deuteronomy, chap. xiii. and xvii., that the Jews were enjoined to put idolators to death—to put their dearest friends to death—to stone them with stones, till they died." They find that they were commanded to destroy whole cities—to put to the sword, men, women, children, and cattle. They find that this was the law under the Jewish economy: and they ask, where was this law repealed? They allege, that, if the law is repealed, the repeal of it should be as public and explicit as the law itself. How would Mr. R. answer such reasoning? I contend that he could not answer it at all, without an abandonment of the unscriptural principle, which he here brings to his aid. I presume he would fall back upon the simple truth, that we have a new dispensation, which in its letter and spirit, "disannuls the commandment going before."

"Did not," says Mr. R., "the Lord know how his command would be understood, and sanction the construction which would naturally be put upon it by his hearers?" Unquestionably, the Lord knew how his command would be understood; but that he sanctioned a construction of it, subversive of its natural import, is a monstrous impeachment of his wisdom. This is to affirm, that Christ in giving a law for *all* nations, did not mean what he said: that the nations are not to learn their duty from his words, but from the colouring which they may fancy Jewish prejudices gave them! This is new light indeed!

3. But after all, Mr. R. does not read the commission through *Jewish*, but through *pedobaptist* prejudices. There is the fullest evidence that the Jews understood the Lord to mean what he said, and not to mean something at war with what he said. Did any of

them ever dream that the commission entitled their *male* children, and their slaves, through all generations, to the privileges of the church of Christ? Where is the evidence of it? The Jews never understood their children to be *included* in any command given to adults.

Mr. R. says, "the converts stickled for Jewish observances, in connection with Christianity; they wished to retain their *old ceremonials*, as circumcision; but never, in one instance, complained of the non-admission of their children." I wonder that Mr. R. should have penned this sentence, as it utterly subverts his theory. How could the Jewish converts understand Christ and the apostles to teach, that Christian observances had taken the place of Jewish, and still *stickle* for circumcision, &c. By the aid of Jewish prejudices, Mr. R. may make Jews of us, but not pedobaptists. But asks Mr. R., "how can we account for the uniform satisfaction of the converts, respecting the classes admitted to baptism," &c.? We can account for it on the simple principle, that the Jewish converts understood the law of admission to Christ's house, and the spiritual nature of the new dispensation, much better than Mr. R. seems to do. With *their* views, it was impossible for them to be dissatisfied with the rejection of their children and slaves from the church of Christ, as Christ had with "great explicitness," confined the right of membership to *disciples* or *believers*.

Mr. R. asks (p. 9.) after quoting Acts ii. 38, 39, "the promise is unto you and to your children," &c. "Would not they understand this as a call to be baptised with their children?" Most certainly, if they and their children would repent, but not otherwise. *This* promise is not a promise of *baptism*, but of the *Holy Ghost*—not to themselves and their children indiscriminately, but simply "to as many as the Lord our God should call!" In this part which we have examined, where, I ask, is Mr. R's. *positive proof*, or *proof* of any description?

Our author comes next to "household baptisms," and says, "the general character of the apostolic baptisms, was household." This would prove nothing for Mr. R., were it true; but true it is not. Amid the thousands of baptisms recorded in the N. T., we find only *three* households, said to have been baptised respectively at one and the same time. Mr. R. finds, besides these three, five other *believing* households, and very properly speaks of them as being baptised. From this he claims that the "*custom* of baptising households," was common.

1. I care not how common it was; its frequency is in perfect harmony with the doctrine of believer's baptism, *unless it can be shewn that infants were baptised in the households*. Let this be done and I will yield willingly. I will not venture to appear before Christ, having resisted such evidence.

2. How does three, or even eight cases of "household baptism," prove its frequency? In the Baptist Church of Bond Street, we have *six* baptised households. One of those families, consisting of the

father and the mother, two children and a servant, were all baptised in the self-same hour. Now if amongst one hundred and seventy disciples, (the number of our members) I find *six* believing families, is it matter of astonishment, that Mr. R. should find amongst all the churches of the New Testament, with their thousands of converts, eight such families—amid thousands of converts, eight believing families are found ; ergo, infants were baptised. Can a rational mind receive such statements as argument ?

Mr. R. reiterates the oft refuted assertion that Baptists do not baptise families. I am willing to compare notes with Mr. R. on this point. I will venture to say that I have baptised as many households *in the self-same hour* as ever he did. Query. Did Mr. R., ever thus baptise a whole household in his life ? Do Pedobaptist missionaries baptise households ? When a man believes, do they baptise his wife, and his children, young and old, on the faith of the head of the house ? *Protestants* do not. Why this parade, then, about *family* baptism. If Mr. R. will receive instances of family baptisms amongst *us*, as arguments against his practice, I will immerse him in them. It is the *usual* practice of Pedobaptists to baptise families one by one as they are born of the flesh ; and it is our *usual* practice to baptise them as they are born of the Spirit.

Mr. R. does not doubt (p. 10.) that infants were baptised in the N. T. household,—“for” says he, “the word translated household in several of the cases, means children.” I am astonished at such an assertion from such a quarter ! Had it been from the pen of his brother in London, C. W., who finds by a refined process of induction, 10,000 baptised families, (swarming with babies,) in the N. T., I would not have been surprised ; but from an intelligent scholar, like Mr. Roaf, it is strange ! The term rendered household, *never* means children. It includes infants, if infants *happen* to be in the house ; but it does not necessary imply their presence. Our term household is a fair representative of the Greek original. It indicates those dwelling together in one house. It is employed to designate the house of Stephanas, of Cornelius, and Crispus, and Onesiphorus, and the Jailor. In all which cases we find *believing* families ; for the baptism of which we plead.

Mr. R. says, “when we read of family after family” [to the enormous number of eight out of thousands of converts] “is it not natural to understand a number of children and some quite young,”—*positive proof* ! Does Mr. R. believe that sane minds will receive his conjectures as proof ? It is, or ought to be, *unnatural* for Christians to “*understand* any thing, not received, as an apology for setting aside a positive law. Mr. R. takes up the case of Lydia. He dwells upon the fact, that the house was *her* house, and *her* heart was opened. Well, what does this prove according to Mr. R. ? It proves, that, “in the matter of baptism the piety belonged to the *individual*, and the baptism to the family” ! Would not this authorise the baptism of the worshippers of Jove, on the faith of a parent ? Would it not bring infants and unconverted adults especially in cases where there was a

church in a house, to the Lord's table? A maiden lady, with servants, could speak of *her* house, with just as much propriety as could a parent. But where is the *proof* that infants were here? Mr. R. *assumes*, that Lydia was, or had been, a married woman—that she had children—that her children were then young—that they were with her, and that they were baptised! What could not Mr. R. *prove* on the same principle of *wholesale assumption*? Has he found a solitary infant in Lydia's house? *Not one!* This fact settles the point. Mr. R. also *assumes* without proof, that the brethren "*comforted*" in Lydia's house, (v. 40.) were not of her household, but the "Philippian brethren." When did Mr. R. learn that at this period there was, save in Lydia's house, a single brother in Philippi? So far as the argument is concerned, I care not if there were ten thousand; but I protest against our brethren taking out of the word of God what it does not teach. Of the Jailor's household, Mr. R. says, "the original conveys no idea of his house believing, but only of his believing through all his family proceedings." What kind of believing would this be? I regret to find such a criticism in Mr. Roaf's work. It is utterly without foundation. Two things are said which indicate the character of this "household." First, it is said that Paul and Silas speak the word to him, "and to ALL that were in his house." Second, it is said, that he rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house." The adverb, "*panoiki*," (from *pasoikos*), means, "*with all one's house*," as given, faithfully, in our version. But though as a *matter of fact* I notice this, I do not need it as an *argument*. Our brethren must *prove* that there were infants in those households. Now, if the salvation of their souls depended upon such proof, it could not be produced.

Mr. R. (p. 11.) says, "The house," in other cases plainly means children; and refers us to Gen. xlv. 26, 27; 1 Tim. iii. 4; and 1 Tim. v. 14. In none of these cases does it mean infants, it includes them if they were there, but does not bring them there. There may be a dozen of infants in a household: but this cannot be ascertained by the word itself. It must be learned from connecting circumstances. A father, and a mother, with one, or two adult children, is as truly a household as they would be were the children "very young." What then, has Mr. R. made of the "households"? Has he found *one* infant in them? I am willing to receive a clear logical *inference* on any subject; but here infants are not in Mr. R's *premises*; how then, I ask, can they by *any* process of logical induction, be forced into his *conclusion*?

But Mr. R. says, "Throughout the scripture history, not a case is recorded of an adult being baptised, who was the child of believing parents." Let Mr. R. point me to the *conversion* of one such child, and I will point him to its baptism; and where is there a recorded instance of their coming to the Lord's table? Does Mr. R. believe that such children were *converted* when they reached the years of accountability? Or does he believe that they came legitimately at a

given age into the possession of that legacy? *Positive proof* indeed!!

Mr. R. comes back, once more, to "of such is the kingdom of heaven," circumcision, &c. He says, (p. 12.) "the Lord recognised the membership of such children." Did he indeed? Why then exclude them from the Supper and all church privileges? Can Mr. R. discover any likeness between carrying young children to Christ to be blest, and carrying them to a minister to be baptised? The Saviour does not say, of *them*, but of *such* is the kingdom of heaven, implying *resemblance* not *identity*. We learn from this passage, not that Christ baptised children, but that he blessed children without baptising them. A glorious truth! But does Mr. R. receive infants indiscriminately to baptism. Not he! Millions of little children are not suffered to come into the "covenant," according to his theory, simply because they have the misfortune to be the children of unconverted parents! Now, I ask, if, because of the want of faith on the part of their parents, such children be excluded from baptism, must they not, according to Mr. R.'s logic, also, be excluded from heaven? Where does Mr. R. find a place for such little ones when they die? Does he send them to the *limbus puerorum* of Popery; or straight to perdition? Surely, he does neither! If, then, he will inform us *how* he gets those *rejected* children into heaven, I will endeavour to put those whom we request, in at the same door.

"The Apostles," says Mr. R., "regarded children, one only of whose parents were believers, as "holy," or set apart and admissible to the house and presence of God, in distinction from the children of other or unbelieving parties, who were declared to be "unclean, &c." Mr. R. mistakes the meaning of this passage altogether. It is against his practice. Let us look at it. The question before the Apostle was, as to whether under the gospel, believers might lawfully live together with unbelievers. This involved a no less serious matter, than the separation of believing husbands or wives from unbelieving wives or husbands, and, as Paul intimates, of *believing* parents from their children. Mr. R.'s grand mistake here, consists in regarding the phrase "*your children*," as referring to the children of the mixed marriage parties; whereas the Apostle refers to the children of the church members indiscriminately. Had the Apostle designed to speak of those children only, who had one parent a believer, and the other an unbeliever, he would have said *their* children, instead of *your* children. In addressing the church, and in giving general precepts, he uses the pronouns *ye* and *you*. (See preceeding chap. throughout, and verses 1 and 5 of this chapter.) But in verse 8, when he gives directions applicable to particular cases, although he introduces the phrase, "I say to the unmarried and widows," he makes reference to these persons, not by the pronoun *you*, but *them*: "It is good for *them* to abide even as I." The same mode of speaking he continues to use as far down as to the verse in question: "let *them* marry,—let *him* not put her away—let *her* not leave him." After the same manner he would have said, "else were *their* children unclean," had he intended only the children of

such mixed cases of marriage as are referred to in the preceding part of the verse; but his language is, else where *your* children. Paul's reasoning then, which a Pedobaptist gloss strips of its force, is simply this: the believing husband, and the believing wife, may dwell together; the heathen husband is holy in regard to the marriage relation, not unclean (as Judaising teachers would represent.) The heathen husbands and wives, because they are unbelieving and out of the church, are not unclean on this account,—else were *your* children unclean, for a similar reason. Or, take Mr. Dagg's paraphrase, thus,—“*The unbelieving husband is not unclean, so that his wife may not lawfully dwell with him. The unbelieving wife is not unclean, so that her husband may not lawfully dwell with her. If they are unclean, then your children are unclean, and not one parent in the whole church must dwell with, or touch his children until God shall convert them.*” The argument, then, of the Apostle in this place, is *fatal* to infant church-membership. His argument implies that all the children of the Corinthian Christians, had no nearer relation to the church, than the unbelieving husband of a believing wife. He declares that their cases are parallel, and that rules of intercourse which would require the believing husband to separate from his unbelieving wife, would require believing parents to separate from their children. But there is no conclusiveness in this argument, if the children had been consecrated to God in baptism, and brought within the pale of the church, for then the children would stand in a very different relation to the church, and to their parents from that of the unbelieving husband or wife. Now, if infant baptism and infant church-membership were things unknown in Corinth and to Paul, ought they to be things known in Toronto and to brethren here? “Positive proof,” in the wrong direction.

In closing his arguments, Mr. R. comes back to the Abrahamic covenant. He quotes a part of the covenant of circumcision, Genesis, xvii : 7., and says, “Spiritual blessings were thus secured to the family :” I reply, 1. God was the God of the Jews in national relationship. He is three times called the God of the worshippers of the golden calf. 2. Whatever spiritual blessings were conferred in the covenant of circumcision *regeneration* was not one of them. The *chief* blessing from this source was, that “to them were committed the oracles of God,” Rom. iii : 1, 2. 3. Under Christ, the old economy, with its ordinances, was annulled, Heb. vii : 18., and a “better covenant established on better promises” introduced Heb. viii : 6, 13. In opposition to this, Mr. R. quotes Gal. iii : 16, 17 : “Now, to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed which is Christ. And this, I say, the covenant which was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of non-effect.” Now, I ask in all earnestness, what has this promise, concerning the *one* seed, to do with the *covenant of circumcision*? This

covenant was confirmed, not in Abraham's natural seed, but "IN CHRIST." The covenant of circumcision was confirmed in Abraham and his *natural* descendants. This covenant looked to all the families of the earth. The covenant of circumcision looked only to Abraham's family. This covenant was given 430 years prior to the law. The covenant of circumcision was given 406 years prior. This covenant secured a way of salvation to Jew and Greek. The covenant of circumcision had no redemption in it. Paul says, (in the 19th verse of the chap. just quoted,) "the law was added because of transgressions, until the seed should come to whom the promise was made." Now, at the giving of the law, there stood before Horeb, hundreds of thousands of the legitimate subjects of circumcision, and yet the "*seed is to come*, to whom this promise was made." It is painful to notice such comments on the word of God. Pedobaptists loose sight of the fact that Abraham was in two different senses a father, and that he had two kinds of children. He was a father of flesh and blood; he was also, "the father of the faithful." These two descriptions of children existed together under the ancient economy, but now, the *natural* branches are broken off, and Abraham's children stand by faith. Abraham has ceased in this covenant to be a father after the flesh, and is now only the "father of the faithful." It is only in this character, that he is known in the gospel dispensation. The Jews claimed, in the presence of Christ, to be the children of Abraham; but our Lord denied their claim, and informed them, that the devil was their father. They were certainly the children of Abraham according to the flesh, but not the children of the father of the faithful. The Baptist, is the only denomination that acknowledges Abraham in this light; all others make him a carnal, as well as a believing father. We claim Abraham, in the *latter* sense, as father; not being Jews, we cannot in the *former*. There are only two senses in which any one *can* be a child of Abraham; he must either possess his *faith* or his *blood*. The child of a Gentile possesses neither the one, nor the other, consequently cannot be entitled to *any* promise given to his *seed*. We say with Paul, "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise;" but our brethren must read it thus,—if your father or your mother be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise! I can not subscribe to such doctrine. With me, Abraham's children are believing children—Christ's house, a spiritual house composed of living stones. To be born of the flesh, gave a title to *all* the privileges of the "commonwealth of Israel." To be born of the Spirit, alone, gives a title to *any* and all of the privileges of a gospel church.

Mr. R. asks several questions which I will now answer.

1. Was the covenant (of circumcision) made with Abraham, made in Christ? I answer, it was not.
2. Did it involve a spiritual relation between God and believers? Ans. It did not.
3. Did it bear as its sign or seal, the rite of circumcision? Ans. Circumcision was attached to that covenant.

4. Was this seal put upon the infants of believers? *Ans.* It was put upon the *male* infants and *slaves* of the descendants of Abraham, whether their parents were believers or not.

5. Was this covenant confirmed at Christ's appearance in the flesh? *Ans.* No. It was confirmed ages before, and if it still has force, the Jews will go back to Canaan; but in this, Gentiles are not at all interested. What then becomes of the "clear right of believer's children to a church standing," as inferred from such data?

Mr. R. *assumes* just such premises as he needs; this may satisfy *some* of his readers—but the intelligent and honest inquirer, will demand *proof* instead of assumption. He *assumes*, that baptism has taken the place of circumcision. I could admit this, were it a fact, (for it would be enough for me to know that *disciples* or *believers* were now its subjects, and not *male* infants eight days old, and slaves young and old,) but it is not a fact. Where is the *proof*? He *assumes*, that baptism is a *seal*. Where, in the word of God, does he learn this? I say that it is not a seal—if it is, let us have the *proof*. Mr. R. speaks of infants having a *church standing*. Have infants and young children a church-standing in Adelaide Street? Are the children of the flesh, and the children of the spirit, there mingled together in church relationship? This, from a Protestant minister of the nineteenth century! Mr. R. calls circumcision "the badge of faith!" Where does he learn that it was in any way connected with faith? Abraham received the sign of circumcision as a seal of the righteousness of the faith which *he* had; but from that hour it became the badge of *blood* and *property*. Surely every reader of the Old Testament is acquainted with this fact! Mr. R. says, "when Christ sent out his Apostles to baptise, he placed no restriction upon their practice!" How *could* Mr. R., with God's *truth* before him, say this? *No restriction!*—Christ commanded the baptism of *disciples* or *believers*. Did he ever enjoin the baptism of *any* other class? What stronger restriction, I ask again, guards the Lord's table? I have now examined Mr. R.'s *positive proofs*, and what are they? Has he in *command*, or *example*, or *inference*, found one case of infant baptism in that Book, by which he and I will soon be judged? In full view of my responsibility, I affirm, that his argument is a mere dream, which can only serve to lead God's people to substitute for a plain law of Christ, a human invention.

Mr. R. next speaks of the import of baptism, when applied to children, and gives us five specifications. Those who invent ordinances, must also furnish them with an import; but the import will usually be as unscriptural as the invention. Mr. R. may have hit the import of *infant* baptism—of this I am not prepared to speak, for my Bible is *silent* on the subject; but one thing I can say, that the import of *Bible* baptism is not found in one, or all of his specifications. How obvious that, Bible baptism, and infant baptism, are two things. Mr. R. calls his ceremony "an act of dedication." Here he abandons even the law of circumcision. He *must* know, that, after that rite was performed, the mother and the child were unclean for three and

thirty days, and that the ceremony of dedication (by appointed sacrifices) was a totally different transaction. Baptists bring their children morning and evening, to the *great sacrifice* offered for sin, and thus never feel the want of a baptismal "legacy."

I have thus followed Mr. R., step by step, through his discourse, and with kindness in my heart towards him, and those who think with him on this subject, I have faithfully, according to my ability, exposed the fallacy of his reasoning. I regret to find such principles of interpretation avowed by Protestants, as are some of those relied on in this work, to bolster up this human tradition. Concede the correctness of such principles to Papists and Puseyites, and you may as well think to arrest the surge of the ocean by logic and eloquence, as think to resist with effect, the rapid march of these soul-destroying systems. May God soon lead his people back to the simplicity of the Bible.

SERMON II.

In this discourse, Mr. R.'s motto is "SPRINKLING, A PROPER MODE OF BAPTISM."

In reading a discussion of an affirmative proposition like the above, one would naturally expect to find a direct appeal to *usage*, in establishing the meaning of the word in question. This course, however, so *indispensably necessary* to the establishment of his premises, Mr. R. declines pursuing, and seeks to prove that sprinkling is baptism, by throwing difficulties in the way of immersion! But will this serve his cause? By the same process, I will undertake to upset the entire canon of inspiration. If I could not, at this period of time, solve one of the difficulties which Mr. R. suggests, it would not invalidate the testimony of God's Spirit. If that Spirit has employed *term* in this case, which always, in literature, sacred, and profane, means literally to immerse, and if Mr. R. proves that immersion in many cases was impossible; he does not thereby prove that baptism means sprinkling, but simply that the Bible is false. A difficulty can never be lawfully urged to set aside a positive declaration, but must be solved in harmony with such declaration. Mr. R.'s difficulties are *imaginary*, but were they *real* they could not serve his purpose.

Mr. R. regards, "the *mode* of administering an ordinance," as of small importance. In this I agree with him; but it is not about the *mode* of an ordinance that I contend, but about the commanded action. The rites instituted by Jehovah, which required sprinkling, pouring, washing or bathing, could only be performed by strict attention in each case to the prescribed form, to neglect the form, was to neglect the rite, to substitute another form for the one commanded, was rebellion, and it is so still.

Mr. R. says, "the Lord's Supper *essentially* requires that we discern the Lord's body." This is not accurate. It *essentially* requires that we eat bread and drink wine, in remembrance of Christ, while in "the

breaking of bread" we are required to "discern the Lord's body."

He continues, "it (the Lord's Supper) does not depend essentially on the part of the day in which it is administered," &c. So baptism is "the answer of a good conscience toward God;" and that answer or response to the gospel promise (what promise?) may be truly made, whether its utterer stand to receive water from above, or be plunged backwards into water beneath. Whichever be the form employed, there is baptism when this answer is sincerely made; and there is not baptism when this answer is not intended. On this I remark:

1. The answer of a good conscience has nothing more to do with the action of baptism, than discerning the Lord's body has to do with the eating and drinking in the supper. A man might *look* at the bread and wine, and claim that he thus discerned the Lord's body. Would Mr. R. think that he had obeyed the command to eat and drink?

2. But *what* is here said to be "the answer of a good conscience?" The Bible says *baptism*, not pouring, or sprinkling, or any thing that human caprice may suggest, but BAPTISM. This, and this alone, is said to be the answer of a good conscience. Now we can only learn what baptism is by a reference to the *usage* of the language.

3. Where, in the word of God, is it ever intimated that one human being's good conscience, can stand for the conscience of another human being? As well might we affirm, that a parent "discerns the Lord's body" for a child; and thus constitutes it a proper subject of the Lord's table, as to affirm that his good conscience prepares it for baptism. Infants then *cannot* "intend this answer," consequently on Mr. R's premises, it is simply *impossible* for them to be baptised.

The first proposition which Mr. R. discusses, is, "the validity of baptism does not depend upon the form in which it is administered."

He says (p. 18.) "baptism is a spiritual act." If I believed this, I should go over to the Quakers. Baptism, with me, is a *physical* act, to be attended to only by disciples or believers. Is the sprinkling of an infant a spiritual act?

Mr. R. says, "Christian baptism is wetting or washing for religious purification." Supposing we try this definition on our author's text: "I indeed wet or wash you with water unto repentance"—he shall wet or wash you with the Holy Ghost and with *fire*! What sort of a wetting or washing would that be? Baptism is no where said to be for religious purification, and if it were, the question would still come up: what is the divinely appointed action or actions to be performed in order to such a result? Mr. R. says, wetting or washing by any means. This I deny. He offers, in proof of his definition, Heb. ix. 10: "we read of divers washings, or divers baptisms, as it is in the original." Well, *divers* does not indicate a variety of actions, but various repetitions of the same action in different cases. Divers flocks of sheep, would not indicate that some of the flocks were goats, the term *sheep* would define the character of each flock. So in this case, the term *baptisms* confines us to immersions.

Mr. R. continues, "these baptisms were employed *upon* cups and pots," &c. If Mr. R. will produce one instance from the Bible or the classics, where water, or blood, or any thing else is said to be baptised *upon* any object, he will do more for the cause of sprinkling and pouring, than all his predecessors put together have accomplished. But I defy him, with all the learning of Toronto at his back, to produce ONE such instance. We find *upon*, following sprinkle or pour, but *never* baptise. Now if baptism meant to pour, or to sprinkle, it would *certainly* be followed in some cases at least by this preposition. An object sprinkled or poured, is always governed by a preposition expressed or understood,—an object baptised, never.

Mr. R. continues, "the administrator used a portable vessel of brass, which stood on one foot. Did he, suppose ye, immerse the tables, or couches, or beds, in the vessel, or did he, with the bunch of hyssop, sprinkle them?"

1. Here is an attempt to establish the meaning of a word, by *supposing a difficulty*. I wish the reader to notice, as we proceed, the *kind* of proof offered in behalf of sprinkling.

2. When Mr. R. spoke of a "portable vessel," he surely must have forgotten, that for the purposes of purification, the Jews had *in* the Temple, ten lavers, and a sea for the priests to bathe in, out of the Temple they had water pots of stone, baths and pools. In those the divers immersions were performed

3. The *one-footed* vessel, referred to by Mr. R., was simply for the washing of the hands and feet of Aaron and his sons. (See Exodus xxx. 18, 21.)

4. Of the purifications under the law, we read, Lev. xi. 32, that, "any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack; whatsoever vessel it be wherein any work is done, it must be *put into water*, (in the original baptised) and it shall be unclean until the even," &c. Again, Num. xxxi. 23, "all that abideth not the fire, ye shall make *go through the water*." Here we have divers baptisms, but not sprinklings!

5. Of the baptism of couches, *Maimonides*, the famous Jewish Rabbi, says:

"A bed that is wholly defiled, if he dips it part by part, it is pure. If he dips a bed in the pool, although the feet are plunged in the thick clay at the bottom of the pool, it is clean. What shall he do with a pillow or bolster of skin? He must dip them and lift them up by the fingers." *Hilchoth Cail*, ch. 16, § 14.

Thus do Mr. R's difficulties vanish into thin air; and thus his sprinkling is here overthrown. I must again maintain that I am under no obligation to meet *such* difficulties—they are not arguments.

Mr. R. says, (p. 19.) "the temple baptisms, were a sprinkling with blood, oil, ashes, and water." With all who believe in the infallibility of our author, this must forever settle the question! For myself, I regard it just as "great a solecism," as if he had said the *immersions* of the Temple were all *sprinklings*. What, under this first head, has Mr. R. *proved*? He rests on *difficulties*, which, were they real, could not serve him legally; but even this foundation is swept away, and what remains?

Mr. R.'s second head, is,—“*There is nothing obligatory in immersion as the mode of baptism.*” He informs us, “that immersion is paraded as an act of exemplary self-denial on the part of the recipient, and he is sent away as having done ‘some great thing,’ Surrounding followers of Christ are bantered as refusing to be immersed merely from a want of courage, they are dared to come and be immersed.” Is all this *just*? Is it *kind*? Is it *true*? Such charges brought against a people who, repudiating the dogma of a baptismal “legacy,” earnestly contend for the doctrine of justification by faith alone, without the deeds of the law, cannot injure them on earth or in heaven.

Mr. R. comes to the subject, and says, “there is not an instance yet produced, where the word ‘baptise,’ in classical authors, means the act performed in immersion.” This is a pitiful evasion! The act performed in immersion,” is immersion itself. *Dare* Mr. R. deny that scores of instances have been produced, where the word means to dip, to plunge, to immerse?

He continues, “There is not an instance in the *Holy Scriptures*, where the word necessarily means that act.” What act? We gather Mr. R.'s meaning from the following assertion:—“We are told that to baptise means to plunge under and raise up another from the water there is no known instance of the word denoting *that act* at all.” True, the word simply does not denote these acts. And, I must be excused for affirming, that no man on earth, or now under the earth, ever *told* Mr. R. that it did. The word means to dip, to plunge, to immerse, the *rising again*, is known by perfectly independent evidence. Still, as an appropriated term, as we shall see shortly, it indicates both burial and resurrection. Circumcision means to *cut around*, and never appears (literally) without this meaning; yet the word alone, is put for the whole rite. What, therefore, Mr. R. calls his “strong assertions” on this point, are utterly without value. He is fighting a figment of his own creation.

He continues, “In the classical authors, the word often means to submerge and keep down a person or thing under the water.” This is not correct. The word never has such a signification in classical usage. It means to submerge, but whether the person or thing submerged goes to the bottom or comes to the top; whether the person or thing be purified or defiled, washed or polluted, drowned or sunken, must be learned from the circumstances in each particular case. The word itself has neither washing, nor wetting, nor sinking, nor drowning in it. Indeed, it has no reference to water at all. It expresses a specific action, namely, dipping, but whether this action takes place in water or oil, in mud or in wax, the word testifieth not. When, then, Mr. R. represents us as saying that the word itself means both putting under and raising up again, he errs. We prove that the word means to dip, or plunge, or immerse. And we prove that by ellipsis and appropriation, in classical and scriptural usage, the idea of rising again was understood, and *thus*, in familiar circumstances, formed a

part of its meaning. One or two examples will illustrate and establish this fact. Homer says:

"As when a smith to harden an iron hatchet, or pole-ax dips it in cold water."

Here the circumstances of the case are so familiar, that the word indicates both immersion and emersion. Again, Plutarch quotes a Sybilline verse, thus:

"Thou mayest be dipped, O bladder! but thou art not fated to sink."

Here it will be seen, that *baptising* and *sinking* are contrasted; and that rising to the top is implied in the word baptise.

In the Bible, the primary word is frequently employed in connection with ritual purification, and in all such cases it denotes, the lifting up from the element, the thing baptised, as truly as it does its dipping, see Exodus, xii: 22. Lev. iv: 6, 17; ix: 9; xiv: 10, 51, &c. We do not find it said in these and similar cases, that the hyssop, or priest's finger, was first dipped into and then drawn out of the blood, water, or oil in order to the performance of the act or acts of purification. The *baptism* in every case denotes both the immersion and emersion. Again, Naaman dipped (baptised) himself seven times in the Jordan. Now, if baptism did not imply, raising from the water, how could Naaman have been said to have baptised himself *seven* times? The *first* baptism would have settled his account on earth.

In the New Testament the word is employed in the same manner, "*dip* the tip of his finger in water,—he to whom I shall give a sop when I have *dipped* it,—a garment *dipped* in blood." In all these cases the word brings the subject from underneath the element into the open air. Here, then, we have specimens of both classical and Bible *usage* before us. I have stated facts, and not fancies, given strong *proofs*, and not made "*strong assertions*." If such evidence is not conclusive, where, on any subject, shall we find conclusive evidence?

Mr. R. says, "There is no example in the Holy Scriptures of baptism meaning the dipping of another in water." Does Mr. R., or any other sane man expect to find the word, either *in* or out of the Scriptures, denoting the administrator, the subject, the action, and the water!!

To express what Mr. R. demands, we have the words—John, and Christ, and immersed in the river Jordan. Every baptism of the New Testament is an example.

Mr. R. says, (p. 20.) "It would only be to ascribe to you a familiarity with the Greek language which even classical scholars will not pretend to, were I to read out passages from this pulpit; I will go with you to the Bible where we can stand upon a level." On this I remark:

1. Mr. R. here *assumes* his ability "to read out passages" from the classics to sustain his practice of sprinkling. He must excuse me for affirming it to be my conviction, that the true reason of his having declined to "read out passages," is to be found in the withering fact, that he *could* not, because no such passages as he would need exist.

2. If an English audience cannot be made to understand the teachings of the Greeks, because they wrote in Greek, how can they be made to understand the Apostles who wrote in the same language? If the common people can occupy a common level with Mr. R. on a translation of the Bible, why may they not also occupy a common level with him on a translation of the classics? This looks like evasion.

3. The masses both *can* and *do* understand examples of the use of any word, when examples are produced. Can they not for example understand the following:—*Lucian*, in *Timon*, the man-hater, makes him say:

"If I should see any one floating toward me upon the rapid torrent, and he should with out stretched hands beseech me to assist him, I would thrust him from me, *baptising* him, until he would rise no more."

Was not *Timon's* baptism immersion?

Polybius, volume iii: page 311, speaks of soldiers passing through water, immersed (baptised) up to the breast. Can any thing be more decisive than this? Mark! the soldiers are not said to have been baptised any further than the water reached.

Porphyry, page 282, says:

"The person who has been a sinner, having gone a little way into it, (the fabulous river of Hell,) is baptised up to the head."

Here, again, the subject of this baptism is not said to be baptised, but only baptised as far as he is immersed, "*up to the head*."

Strabo, *Geog.* page 809, speaks of a river, whose waters are so buoyant, that if an arrow be thrown in, it would scarcely be immersed, (baptised).

He mentions, also, a lake, page 1108, on the top of which bitumen floats in which "a man *cannot be baptised*, but is forcibly kept above."

Now, is there a man of common discernment in any congregation that cannot, without comment, understand, and feel the force of these examples? Here, sprinkling, and pouring, and wetting, and washing, are all simply out of the question.

Josephus, who was himself a Jew, who lived in the apostolic age, and who certainly knew how the Jews employed the Greek, always employed this word, literally and figuratively, just as the Greeks did. He says, *Antiq. L.* 9, concerning the ship in which *Jonah* attempted to flee from the presence of the Lord, "the ship was *about to be baptised*." It was wetted, washed, poured, and sprinkled in the stormy ocean, but not *baptised*. He uses the same word twice concerning the death of *Aristobulus*, who was drowned at *Jericho*, by certain Greeks, who enticed him into the water to swim, and then, *baptising* him as in sport they did not leave off until they entirely drowned him." Surely such examples may be understood by any mind yet free to think on this subject!

I have introduced the above instances, (mere specimens selected from scores of examples lying before me) for the double purpose of exhibiting the true meaning of the word baptism, and of shewing

that plain men can decide this question for themselves, if they choose to weigh facts, and repudiate *assertions*. If the word, dipped every thing which the Greeks wished to dip, and never sprinkled nor poured water, or any thing else, upon the person or thing baptised. If the word, under the law, dipped hyssop, and scarlet yarn, and birds, and fingers, and feet, but never, amid all the pourings and sprinklings mentioned, indicated *one* of them—how comes it that this same word, all at once, by some mysterious process assumes a *new* meaning in the commission of Christ? A meaning too, which subverts its established specific character. How comes it, that the word, without cavil, dipped Naaman seven times in the Jordan, and yet, with the same syntax, refuses to dip Christ in the same river? Do not men forget, that there is at hand a resurrection morning, and a judgment day!

Mr. R. proceeds and asks, "To what methods of applying water does the term baptise refer," I reply, that it refers to no methods whatever of "applying water;" but to a method of applying a subject. It is always the subject that is said to be baptised—never the water.

Mr. R.'s first *proof* that immersion is not essential to baptism is given in the following quotation from scripture, "And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Phillip and the Eunuch; and he baptised him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Phillip." What think you, reader, of such evidence. Mr. R. toils hard to get out of the grasp of this plain passage. He struggles hard to silence its honest testimony; but in vain. This passage is of itself sufficient to settle the dispute. Look at its various parts—

1. They came *to* (epi) a certain water.
2. They went both down *into* (eis) the water.
3. The Eunuch is baptised.
4. They come up *out of* (ek) the water.

Did Mr. R. ever imitate this example in his life. This is Baptist practice precisely; and no man, woman, or child, who ever witnessed the immersion of a believer, can fail to perceive the resemblance.

But Mr. R. is certain that the going down *into*, and coming up *out of* the water, did not plunge the Eunuch. If Mr. R. supposes that we understand the prepositions to mean immerse, and rise again, he errs, and ought better to inform himself. I go down *into* the water with a subject, and we both come up *out of* the water; but I do something more than this, I do what Philip did to the Eunuch, I *baptise* the subject. "But why," asks Mr. R., "did they go down into the water and come up out of it, unless for immersion?" And I repeat the question emphatically. Common sense will never be able to discover another reason? Mr. R. is aware of this, hence he tries another tack. He says, "It is *not said in the original*, that they went into the water and came up out of it, it is only said that they went unto, and came from it." On this, I remark:

1. Mr. R. has here abandoned his common level; left the English

Bible, and dipped into the Greek, and has after all misrepresented its teaching. Had he said as some Pedobaptists have said before him, that *eis*, and *ek*, have sometimes the meanings for which he contends, and therefore, prove nothing, I would not have been surprised, but to affirm without qualification, that the prepositions do not express *into*, and *out of*, but *unto*, and *from*, is sheer misrepresentation.

2. The primary and ordinary meanings of these prepositions are *into*, and *out of*. Like most other words, they have secondary meanings; but no critic or translator is at liberty to employ the secondary meaning of these or other terms at random. He is bound to give them their primary or ordinary signification, in every instance when circumstances do not demand a secondary meaning. For example, I can prove that the word *God*, in the original language, has a secondary meaning, and refers to finite objects, but am I at liberty in reading the Bible to take at random the meaning that suits me? Unitarians do so, and thus rob Christ of his glory. *Everlasting* has a secondary meaning, and Universalists, seize it lawlessly and get rid of everlasting punishment. In the same lawless manner, I might say, *eis*, signifies against, and quote in proof, "if thy brother sin (*eis*), against thee,"—I might then affirm that *ek* means through, and quote as proof, 2 Corinthians, xiii: 4; Having thus established my premises as righteously as Mr. R. has done his, I might read the passage thus: "they went down *against* the water and came up *through* it." Adopting this lawless mode of procedure, I might prove, that God never put the man *into* the Garden of Eden, only *to* it; and that he never drove him *out of* it, but only *from* it. I might prove, that Daniel was not cast *into* the den of lions, but only *to* its edge, and that he did not come *out of* the den, but only *from* it. That Joseph was not cast into a pit, nor taken out again; that the wicked do not go *into* hell, nor the righteous *into* heaven. The word of God might be reduced to chaos on such principles.

3. What other prepositions would, or *could* the inspired penman have employed to indicate *into* and *out of*, than *eis*, followed by *ek*? Can an example be produced where these prepositions ever mean any thing else than *into* and *out of* when thus situated?

4. This first preposition takes men *into* gardens, seas, pits, dens, fiery-furnaces; *into* fields, countries, villages, cities, synagogues, temples, houses, heaven, and hell, &c; and yet, is it not passing strange, that by no force of circumstances, can it be made to take a willing disciple into the water for baptism!! What a fearful responsibility rests upon the souls of learned men! Our version gives us here a literal rendering of the original, and I ask again, why did they both go down into the water, unless for immersion? Nay! why should they go near the water at all. Dr. Doddridge well remarks on this passage:—"It would be very unnatural to suppose, that they went down to the water merely that Philip might take up a little water in his hand to *pour* on the Eunuch. A person of his dignity, had, no doubt, many vessels in his baggage on such a journey through

a desert country; a precaution absolutely necessary for travellers in those parts, and never omitted by them. *Fam. Ex.* But what Mr. R. fails to do by criticism, he attempts to accomplish by *supposing difficulties*. He says, "in a desert, it was not likely that there would be a stream ample enough for plunging in. No history or geography speaks of a river there—there is now no trace of any old river-bed there," &c.

1. I have the highest authority in the universe for affirming that there was "*a certain water*" there, whether river, or pond, I know not, and care not. My geography, here, is the New Testament—my historian the Holy Spirit. I envy not the mental condition of the man, whoever he may be, who cannot believe this historian without a human endorser.

2. The principle here advanced is an infidel one. Gibbon affirms that the Bible is false because it makes Palestine a *fertile* land, whereas it is notoriously *sterile*. We tell him that he cannot judge of what it was by what it is. The curse of God is now upon it, and earthquakes and storms have produced vast physical changes. So say I to Mr. R.

Mr. R. proceeds, "when we read of baptism in houses and cities, nothing of going down into water, or coming up out of water is found." Did not Mr. R. perceive that this cavil might be turned against himself? Might I not say, "when we read of baptism in houses and cities, nothing of *pitchers or basins, or towels or handkerchiefs to wipe the minister's fingers or the baby's face*, is found;" those "great features" of a sprinkling for baptism! Mr. R. *supplies* such circumstances as belong to sprinkling, instead of supplying the legitimate circumstances. The Spirit *rarely* gives a detailed account of the circumstances connected with the performance of any rite.

Mr. R. says, "not a word is said about the eunuch changing his clothes: or of Philip producing a baptismal suit: or of the eunuchs driving away thoroughly drenched." A contemptible *sneer* will go further, with some minds, than an *argument*. Our author seems to understand this. Mr. R. can conjecture certain waters out of the way; and certain cups or basins, towels or handkerchiefs into the way; he can conjecture that the eunuch's feet needed refreshing in the baptismal water! and yet he dare not hazard the bold supposition, that after his baptism, the eunuch had common sense enough to take care of himself. I never before heard of such a string of imaginary difficulties being offered to an intelligent people as *arguments*.

Mr. R. next takes up John's baptising, and does a large wholesale business in the line of *assumptions* and *difficulties*. He makes John select places of much water, to furnish the people with facilities "for refreshment and cleanliness." He tells us also, that, "in that arid region, wells were commonly twenty miles apart." Now does it not seem strange, that those people who lived all the days of their lives, seven, eight, nine and ten miles from the well, should need so much water, when they came together to be sprinkled! But Mr. R. says,

"John had in view a *protracted meeting*!" Where does he learn, that the same people ever spent a whole day or night with John? When conjectures are brought to set aside the testimony of the Spirit, we *must* repudiate them. What rational reason, I ask, *can* be given for John's selecting places of much water, unless for immersion. The tribes of Israel did not meet in their triennial gatherings; at Jordan, but at Jerusalem, a place where Mr. R. finds an alarming scarcity of water. The testimony of the Spirit is,—not that John was *preaching* (or holding a protracted meeting) at Enon, because there was much water there; but it is said, he was *baptising*, because there was much water there. Can a child of God need other testimony than this? Must we here, too, have a historian or geographer to endorse for the Spirit?

But, Mr. R. says, "Enon was a well in a cave, like that of Samaria, where water was drawn, and into which it would neither be decent, lawful, nor possible to plunge a human body." Ergo, the word baptism means to sprinkle!! What do we know about Enon? Conflicting conjectures are the only data from which we can judge of its character. But whether it was a natural spring called the "*Dove's Eye*," or an artificial "fountain of the sun," or something else, matters but little. The Bible says, there was "*much water*" there. But here again, we are thrown aback. Mr. R. says, "much water there, means many waters, and it expressed the fact of their being several small springs and rivulets round about." Rather a watery place after all, in an "arid region!" By what process of philological legerdemain, does Mr. R. metamorphose "many waters" (*pollu ludata*) into many "*small springs and rivulets*." There is neither *spring* nor *rivulet* in the phrase. "It is observable," says Robinson, "that the river Euphrates, at Babylon; Tiber, at Rome; and Jordan, in Palestine, are all described by *many waters*. The thunder which agitates clouds, charged with floods, is called the voice of the Lord upon *many waters*. And the attachment that no mortifications can annihilate, is a love, which *many waters* cannot quench, neither can the *floods* drown. How it comes, that a mode of speaking, which on every other occasion signifies *much*, should, in the case of baptism, signify *little*, is a question easy to answer."

But it seems we have other *difficulties* to encounter, before we can be permitted to suffer John to proceed quietly with his work of immersing repenting sinners. If Enon is too shallow, Jordan, it seems, is too rapid and deep. Mr. R. says, "the Jordan is six or seven feet deep close to the shore." Why did he not say that it was twenty feet deep; it would have been just as true (referring to some turn in the river) as what he has said. *Robinson* says:

"The river banks are generally wooded; channel sometimes *broad* and *shallow*, sometimes rapid and deep, &c."

Burchardt says:

"The river where we passed it, was about eighty paces broad, and three feet deep."

A writer in the *Dublin University Magazine*, as quoted by the *Globe*, November 23rd, 1850, says, (speaking of a certain point in the river) :

"Nor is it improbable that here John the Baptist was baptising, and that here our blessed Lord, as he came up out of the waters, received the public seal of his ministry, when the Holy Ghost came upon him," &c.

He represents the stream as rapid, but "*shallow near the bank.*" Here men and women can bathe without difficulty. Why, I ask, did Mr. R. in this case, omit an important part of the truth? He obviously felt the need of a *difficulty* to silence the testimony of the Jordan. I quote one more author on this point, and leave it; Mark says, "they were all baptised of him *in the river of Jordan.*"

But Mr. R. has yet more *difficulties*. The people had no changes of raiment. He says, "they came out to *hear*, and not expecting to be baptised." Who told Mr. R. this? *Matthew* says, "but when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees, come to his *baptism.*" Now these classes came for the same purpose that others did, and they *came to his baptism.*

Mr. R. says the people must either have been baptised and remained saturated in their ordinary clothes, or stripped; and adds, "they clearly did neither, and therefore were not immersed." This is demonstration itself! Mr. R. is certainly right in supposing, that if the people were neither baptised *in* their clothes nor *out of* them, that they were not immersed! His *argument* here, is simply this: it is not stated in detail, that those whom John baptised, did all that was necessary to preserve health and decency, *therefore* they were not *baptised*, but *sprinkled!!* And this is proof!

But Mr. R. finds yet another *difficulty* more formidable than its fellows. He tells us, that John must have baptised, in six months, "two millions" of people, and says, "if he occupied the whole six months in the operation, he passed through his hands 12,800 a day, a number which it was physically impossible to immerse, but which he could have sprinkled *in large numbers* with great ease." How, I ask, could he have sprinkled them? Perhaps the *Salopian Zealot* can inform us. He says:

"The Jews in *Jordan* were baptised,
Therefore, ingenious John devised
A scoop, or squirt, or some such thing,
With which some water he might fling
Upon the long extended rank
Of candidates that lined the bank;
Be careful, *John*, some drops may fall
From your rare instrument on all,
But point your engine nevertheless
To those who first their sins confess:
Let no revilers in the crowd,
The holy sprinkling be allowed."

I remark on Mr. R's calculation:

1. That John was not a Jewish priest, and might therefore have baptised six years, instead of six months before Christ. On this point we have no *proof*.

2. Two things are affirmed in relation to John's candidates: first, they confessed their sins; second, they were baptised. Now, how could men confess their sins at the rate of eighteen a minute? It was "physically impossible." Mr. R's. calculation, then, reduces the scripture record of the fact, to a *falsehood*. Can a just cause demand this?

3. Mr. R. makes the phraseology, "Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan," to mean all the inhabitants of these places. This is erroneous—for if John baptised *all the inhabitants* in Jordan, why in the name of common sense was he shortly afterwards baptising large numbers at Enon? Besides, all that came to his baptism were not received. Certain classes rejected the council of God against themselves, not being baptised with the baptism of John. His business was to prepare a people for the Lord. And to assume that he baptised any but those who confessed their sins, is to *contradict the Bible*. Thus sink, one after another, our author's fearful difficulties. But supposing we try Mr. R's. mode of reasoning for a moment, on another subject. How could Abraham "in the self-same day," Gen. xvii. 23, circumcise more than three hundred and eighteen individuals? It took longer time to circumcise one, than to immerse six. Was not the thing "physically impossible?" And then, not one word is said about flowing blood, or binding up of wounds, nor are the candidates said to have covered themselves after the rite! The difficulty in the numbers, then, together with the absence of those circumstances which health and decency would have demanded—the absence of those "great features" in every circumcision, prove, according to Mr. R's. logic, that they were not *circumcised*. Abraham, perhaps, touched their foreheads with his *finger*, for it is not even said that he had a knife! I could upset revelation itself, on such principles!

But the people were baptised *in* the river Jordan, we are told. No; so, says Mr. R., "it would be as correct a reading of the original to *read at* Jordan, or *with* Jordan, for these are as ordinary meanings of the prepositions used by the Scripture historians, as *in*, or *into*." What will the reader think of such a statement, when he is informed, that by a careful examination, it has been ascertained that the preposition (*en*) "*in*" occurs in the New Testament 2660 times, and that out of this immense number of occurrences, it is translated "*in*" 2045 times; and amongst the remaining instances, in many cases, it should have been rendered "*in*." In the original, it is said, I baptise you (*en*) "*in*," not *with* water. He shall baptise you (*en*) "*in*" not *with* the Holy Ghost. G. Campbell, (Principal of Marischal College, Aberdeen) says:

"So inconsistent are the interpreters last mentioned, that none of them have scrupled to render *en* to *Jordanee*, *in* *Jordan*; though nothing can be plainer than that, if there be any incongruity in the expression *in* *water*, this *in* *Jordan* must be equally incongruous. But they have seen, that the preposition *in* could not be avoided there, without adopting a circumlocution which would have made this deviation from the text too glaring. *The true partizan of whatever denomination, always inclines to correct the diction of the Spirit by that of the party.*"

At water, and at the Holy Spirit, is inadmissible—while *with the Jordan* (seven feet deep and one hundred and fifty wide,) is a superlative absurdity.

But Mr. R. asks, "what was the mode of baptising with the Holy Ghost and with fire, clearly by the descent of the Holy Ghost and cloven tongues of fire which sat upon them." On this I remark:

1. The *descent* of the Holy Ghost is nowhere called *baptism*. And a partial application of divine influence, such as is set forth in the sprinkling of a babe, is a cruel mockery. On Pentecost, they were *overwhelmed* in divine influence. Who doubts this?

2. The communication and reception of the influences of the Spirit, are represented by a variety of figures. By the springing up of water: by blowing like the wind: by flowing like a river: by the emission of breath: by the drinking of water: by the pouring out of water, and by baptism in water. Now why is "pouring out" seized, without a warrant, and applied to baptism, while the others are rejected? Is not the reason transparent? Why, I ask, are not springing up, blowing, flowing, breathing, drinking, &c., regarded as so many modes of baptism? What claim has *pouring*, that these have not? Why confound pouring and baptism, any more than blowing and baptism, or pouring and drinking? The Spirit is *never* said to be *baptised* UPON men.

3. On the day of Pentecost, we are told, "there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it *filled all the house where they were sitting*, and there appeared cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat on each of them. Here, we perceive, that the emblems of the Spirit were above and around them. They were enveloped in those emblems, as they had been in water at their baptism. Mr. R. confounds what is perfectly distinct, the descent of the Spirit, with the baptism of the disciples. Previous to a baptism in our chapel, water is poured into the baptistry; this pouring is *in order to* the baptism; but what would you think of the man who should make it the baptism itself? Not more incongruously would such an one reason, than does the man who calls the descent of the Spirit, the baptism of the disciples.

4. The *copiousness* of the Spirit's gifts, is indicated by the baptism in the Spirit. Destroy this idea, so beautifully presented by the figure of submerging into divine influence, and you dishonor the work of the Spirit.

Mr. R. next says, "our Lord himself, received the baptism of John, to which I have just referred the *descending* of the element upon him." With my views, I would not be the author of this *assertion* for the universe. Did John baptise the water *upon* Christ? The Bible says: not merely that our Redeemer was baptised "*in*" the Jordan, but (*eis*) "*into*" the Jordan. It is just as certain that Christ was immersed into the Jordan, as it is that language has a meaning. The same proposition which took him into houses, synagogues, temples, cities, villages, and ultimately *into heaven itself*, took him *into* the Jordan.

May the time soon arrive when all who love Christ, shall be led to follow his example. To justify his *assertion*, that Christ might go into Jordan without being immersed: Mr. R. says, "in the Greek church, *it has been customary* for the recipients of baptism to kneel in a font, while a priest lifted up water and poured it on the head." I can only here save Mr. R.'s *honesty* at the expense of his *intelligence*, The Greeks *pour upon* and call it *baptism!!!* On the contrary, they have from first to last, practised *true* immersion, and that, too, in the coldest regions on the face of the earth. Can it be necessary to prove this? I will give one authority, which no Pedobaptist will accuse of unfairness. I mean Professor Stuart, of Andover, (a Presbyterian.) He says:

"The mode of baptism by immersion, the oriental church has always continued to preserve, even down to the present time. The members of this church are accustomed to call the members of the western church, *sprinkled Christians*, by way of ridicule and contempt. They maintain that *baptizo* can mean nothing but immerse, and that *baptism by sprinkling*, is as great a solecism as *immersion by sprinkling*; and they claim to themselves, the honor of having preserved the ancient sacred rite of the church free from change, and from corruption, which would destroy its significance."

On this subject, W. Judd makes the following remark:

"The testimony of the Greeks is conclusive. It puts the question beyond reasonable dispute. I cannot see how the man who has the perverseness to rise up and contradict them, can be entitled in this matter, either to respect or courtesy; for he outrages reason and common sense. If the *Greeks themselves* are not competent judges of a *Greek word*, where shall we find those who are?"

The Greeks charge those who speak of baptism by sprinkling, with uttering an absurdity. Surely Baptists are on this point, in safe company.

Mr. R. speaks of ancient *pictures* representing pouring as baptism, in the case of Christ. The trouble with the pictures is, that they are not, by very many centuries, ancient enough. I commend to his notice, the language of Pope Benedict XIV. When *Paul Maria Paciandi* presented those pictures, with others, to his holiness, the Pope exclaimed:

"Nothing can be more monstrous than these emblems! Was our Lord Christ baptised by aspersion? This is so far from being true, that nothing can be more opposite to truth; and it is to be attributed to the *ignorance* and *rashness* of workmen."

The idea that Christ was poured upon, it will be seen, is ascribed by Benedict, who believed in sprinkling, to ignorance and rashness.

Mr. R. next makes the strange remark that, "Aaron and his sons were baptised with water at the door of the tabernacle (Lev. viii. 6.) and with oil, (Lev. viii. 12,) and with blood, (v. 23, 24.)" It is with extreme reluctance that I say, that there is *no truth* in the above assertion. Every man capable of deciphering the Greek character, and who has looked into the chapter referred to, MUST know, that baptism is not once named in it. Take one of Mr. R.'s examples of *baptism*, Lev. viii. 23, "And Moses took of the blood of it, and put it upon the tip of Aaron's right ear, and upon the thumb of

his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot." So it seems, *smearing the tip of the ear, the thumb, and the great toe, is BAPTISM!!* What shall we have next? I raise my humble protest against such trifling with God's word, and the consciences of dying mortals.

Mr. R. next refers to the case of Cornelius; "can any man *forbid* water." Now, says Mr. R., "if any could forbid water, that water must have been what could be moved to Cornelius." How, I ask, can this serve the cause of sprinkling? If Mr. R. can 'move' enough of water to fill a cup, I can as *righteously* move enough to fill a bath. If the Holy Spirit had intended to say, who can forbid a cup of water to be brought in for the purpose of sprinkling, he would have done so. But nothing of the kind is said. The phrase simply implies,—can any object to the baptism of these persons? As a matter of fact, water was, and is brought in to fill baths. I, myself, have had water brought into a private bath, and in it baptised with great ease, a joyful disciple. Baptism and not sprinkling took place here. Mr. R. next comes to Samaria, and conjures up another *difficulty* to establish the meaning of a plain word. He finds not one drop of water in Samaria, except in Jacob's well. Now, the truth is, Mr. R. knows nothing at all about the water resources of Samaria in those days. This, I again say, is an infidel argument. If Mr. R. may use it, so may Gibbon. But is it not marvellous, that Mr. R. can find *enough* of water for purposes of refreshment and ablution for all the people; *enough* of water for all their cattle, 365 days in every year, and yet, on one joyous occasion, can find no water in which to baptise the happy disciples! A strange process this by which to evade the established meaning of the word! If Samaria had water enough for the ordinary purposes of man and beast, it had enough for baptism. Mr. R. next speaks of Paul's baptism, and we have more *difficulties* to establish the meaning of a word. He thinks "it is *not likely*" that immersion was here practised,—"*not probable*" that their baths were large enough. What, in the name of reason has Mr. R.'s. "*not likeliest*" and "*not probablies*" to do in a question of this character? Is it not very "*likely*" that Paul obeyed God? But he was exhausted, we are informed, and Mr. R. says: Paul "*arose*" to be baptised; the act which he would have to perform, for receiving baptism from Ananias." *Why*, I ask, was it necessary for an exhausted man to *arise* to be sprinkled? The command to *arise* in order to immersion, was *necessary*, while to *arise* in order to be sprinkled was *not necessary*. Such phraseology is frequently employed in scripture as an incitement to some course of conduct, as, *Arise*, go over this Jordan,—*arise*, shine; *arise*, and stand upon thy feet, &c. Besides Paul's baptism was an emblematic *washing*,—sprinkling is *never* in figure or in fact a washing. Lastly, Paul himself tells us that he and others were buried in baptism.

The Jailor comes next, and Mr. R. says, "it *cannot be supposed* that he had a bath in a heathen prison." One thing is in evidence

he had a river close by, and the cloud of midnight was a sufficient guard for him. Look at the circumstances of this case. *First*, the Jailer, with his light in his hand, brings them out. *Second*, they preach to all in the house. *Third*, he takes them, (it does not mention where) the same hour of the night, washes their stripes, and is baptised, he and his. *Fourth*, he brings them into the house and sets meat before them. Now, *why* did they leave the house at *midnight*, unless for immersion? Mr. R.'s difficulties not unfrequently testify against him, and under the rack of his torture cry out *immersion*. Mr. R. next takes up the baptism of the 3,000. The sum of his *argument* is, that twelve men could not have accomplished the work! Now, I should like to be *one* of twelve who should again have such a privilege. A few years ago, I baptised 35 individuals "*decently and in order*" in just 30 minutes. At this rate, four hours would have been amply sufficient, in which to have baptised the whole 3,000. But we learn from Acts, x: 48; that the Apostles commanded assistance even on small baptising occasions, and why not here? All will admit then, that the seventy disciples had a right to baptise. These added to the 12, would give us 82 baptisers, and this number would accomplish the work with ease in 40 minutes. Baptist ministers cannot fail to smile at such calculations.

But we have still another *difficulty*. No water! No water! Alas for the teeming inhabitants of Jerusalem! Alas, for the parched and thirsty tribes of Israel! Alas, for man and beast! But stop! my commiseration is misapplied, totally! There was enough of water for all the ordinary purposes of the tens of thousands of men and beasts in the city, enough for ox, enough for ass, but there was not enough in which to *baptise* those 3,000 believers. Desperate must be the cause that demands *such* a defence.

We find, however, that water was not so scarce an article in Jerusalem in those days, as many seem to imagine. To say nothing of the numerous private baths, and places in the Temple, (and the disciples had access to the Temple and "had favour with all the people,") there was the pool of *Siloam* and *Bethesda*. This last pool, Maundrell makes 120 paces long, 40 broad, and 8 deep—"which basin" says Calmet, "being deeper in some places than in others, uneven at the bottom, might be deep enough to swim in in some parts, while in others it might merely serve to wash the sheep." According to the dimensions given by *Chateaubriand*, it measures "150 feet long, and 40 wide, or 380 feet around! Now, taking this lowest measurement, 80 administrators of baptism might stand within its verge 4 feet apart, and, in 40 minutes or less, baptise the 3,000.

I notice these quibbles, not because I regard them as affecting my practice as a Baptist, that practice rests upon the Divine *record*. The word finds water enough in every instance, with as much certainty as the word circumcision finds a knife; but I notice them simply because many honest-hearted enquirers suppose them to have force. As to the hackneyed idea that the converts

had no changes of raiment, at a feast of the Jews, the assumption is most gratuitous. And again, I say, that there is just as much evidence to prove that they had common sense enough to decently take care of themselves, as there is to prove, that circumcised persons had to take care of themselves.

We have next brought under our notice, Romans, vi : 4; and Colossians, ii : 12, buried with Christ by baptism. These passages, one would naturally suppose, place our practice beyond the reach of even cavil itself; but Mr. R. says, "there is nothing in immersion like burial!" I appeal to the common sense of every man, woman and child, who has eyes to see, or intelligence to discover the resemblance between an object and its well defined shadow. Surely, we *bury* our candidates in baptism. And surely, we *raise* them again! But, says Mr. R., "when a body is buried it is not dipped and raised again, or rather, the feet and legs first placed in the ground, and the rest of the corpse plunged and raised Besides, if our Lord's burial is to be imitated, there must be a baptising horizontally, for the cave or tomb in which he was buried was in the side of a rock; and bodies were put into it laterally, and not by lowering or dipping." On this I remark:

1. Bodies are *buried* in the ground; and my Bible teaches the sublime doctrine that they shall be *raised again*.

2. Christ was *buried* and *rose again*. These are facts!

3. Mr. R. reasons here just as might a person totally ignorant of the nature of symbolical language. The mere *circumstances* connected with any transaction symbolized, are *never* in the symbol. Thus, the paschal lamb, was not *crucified*, yet it was a *perfect* symbol, it was a lamb *slain*. On the great day of atonement, the goat was not crucified, but its *blood was spilt*, and it was *sacrificed*. Now, as in these cases, had not the victims been *put to death*, they could not have symbolized the *death* of Christ; so, unless baptism be a *burial* in water and a *resurrection* out of it, it is absurd to say, that "we are *buried* with him, *by* and *in* BAPTISM, *that*, like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Again, in the Supper we have an emblematical representation of Christ's death. But Mr. R. might say, "if our Lord's death is to be imitated, there must be a *crucifixion*!" He can perceive without difficulty a beautiful emblem of Christ's death in the breaking of bread, and in the pouring out of wine; but cannot discover any likeness to his burial, and resurrection, in a *burial in*, and *resurrection from* water. Here he must have all the *circumstances of a funeral*, connected with the *burial* else it is no *burial*! Was ever trifling with a solemn subject more apparent? But Mr. R. makes us say, "that the *mode*, not the result, is essential to baptism." This is a mistake; we make the divinely appointed emblems essential to baptism. But Mr. R. confounds the ordinance with its concomitants. The Lord's Supper may be attended to, in the evening, in a house, or a chapel; but

the *bread must be broken*; so in baptism, the candidate may be dressed in white, or in black, baptised backwards or forwards, to the right hand, or the left, *mode* is nothing, provided, the subject be *buried and raised again*. The Spirit has left us in attending to these *divinely appointed symbols*, to select *circumstances*, most convenient. *Uncommanded* concomitants may vary, but the *thing* commanded never, until the heavens pass with a mighty noise.

4. No sophistry can ever take away from these passages, *burial* and *resurrection*, and as we have in the Supper, a real, (not a spiritual), *breaking of bread*, so in baptism, we have a real *burial*. In this ordinance, we not only, exhibit the *burial* and resurrection of our Lord, but also, profess to be dead to the world, to be buried *with Christ*, and to rise to newness of life. Dr. Chalmers thus reasons on the verse:

"Jesus Christ, by death, underwent this sort of baptism—even immersion under the surface of the ground, whence he soon emerged again by his resurrection.—We, by being baptised into his death, are conceived to have made a similar translation. In the act of descending under the water of baptism, to have reigned an old life; and in the act of ascending, to emerge into a second, or new life; along the course of which, it is our part to maintain a strenuous avoidance of that sin which as good as expunged the being we had formerly; and a strenuous prosecution of that holiness which should begin with the first moment that we were ushered into our present being, and be perpetuated, and make progress toward the perfection of full and ripened immortality."

Planted together in the likeness of his death, and being in the likeness of his resurrection is a similar figure. Paul employs the burying of grain in the earth, and its springing up again to prefigure the resurrection of the body. The *old man*, is said to be crucified; but we are never said to be buried with Christ in crucifixion? Who would not feel the incongruity of such a figure. And who does not feel the incongruity of being buried with Christ by *sprinkling*.

Mr. R. next notices the baptism of the Israelites in the Red Sea, and conjectures that they were "*probably sprinkled by the spray*." This was not a case of christian baptism, but it *was* a burial, and resurrection. They went down into the sea,—the waters stood like walls on both sides, "*congealed in the heart of the sea*," the guardian cloud covered them—and thus, they were all immersed unto Moses, *in the cloud*, and *in the sea*.

He next notices the baptism of Nebuchadnezzar in the dew of heaven, and says, "This dew must have decended upon him." Yes, but the dew is not said to have been *baptised upon* him. It was the body of the ill-fated monarch that was baptised and not the dew. The passage is literally, his body was immersed in the dew of heaven. Destroy this beautiful figure, and you upset the meaning, and force of the passage. Our own Milton, has a similar phrase, it is this:

"A cold shuddering dew *dips* me all o'er."

And Spencer says:

"With verses *dipt* in dew of Castalie."

Could any man fail to feel the force, and see the beauty of these figures? Would any man argue from them that *dip* meant to *sprinkle*? Yet these are cases parallel to the one before us. The King was overwhelmed in the dew.

Mr. R. comes next, to his last head, which reads, "AFFUSION, POURING, OR SPRINKLING, IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE HOLY SCRIPTURES." Here, I *did* expect, to meet the writer in a plain common sense argument! I *did* expect, to find a straight-forward appeal, to the usage of the language! I had a right to expect, that at least ONE passage would be produced where *baptizo* or its cognates, were rendered *sprinkle*; or where water, or blood, or oil, was said to be baptised *upon* some person, or thing. But such a passage has not yet been "read out," and, mark, reader! NEVER WILL BE! Let Mr. R. tell *why*!

Our author's first and main argument. is simply this: I have proven *immersion* to have been *impossible*, in many cases; therefore, *sprinkling* is baptism!! I deny, that Mr. R's. conclusion is in his premises. A learned infidel would adopt Mr. R's premises, and effectually resist his conclusion. He would say with Professor Stuart, "the word means to dip, to plunge, to immerse, *all critics and lexicographers of any note are agreed in this*"—and the Greeks themselves thus understand it, *therefore*, the Bible is false! But I have annihilated Mr. R's. *difficulties*, (though not bound to do it,) and have thus sustained both the ordinance and the Bible.

But Mr. R. says, "*pouring* is more suited to the representation, and significant purpose of baptism." What likeness, I ask, is there between *pouring* and a *burial* and *resurrection*? Where Christ's death and resurrection is not set forth in baptism, and the believer's union with him in these, there can be no christian baptism. Now, is *pouring*, a *burial*? Where then is its "*significancy*." Mr. R. says, "baptism is a sign of the cleansing away of sin by Christ's blood." In the emblematical waters, sins are said to be "*washed away*," but this part of the emblem is as fatal to the pretensions of sprinkling, as is the *burial* or *resurrection*. Sprinkling is no more a mode of *washing* than it is of *immersing*; and if it were, it would not affect this question. Leviticus, vi: 27, we read, "when there is *sprinkled* of the blood thereof on any garment, thou shalt *wash* that whereon it was sprinkled in the holy place." Here, *sprinkling* and *washing* are presented by the Spirit, as two very different affairs. Sprinkling, then, preserves NO PART of the "significant purpose of baptism." God has not ordained this as an emblem, but something else; and who has a right to change his enactments? Christ sprinkles the *heart* from an evil conscience, while the body on the contrary, is said to be washed with pure water.

Mr. R. says, "plunging into the blood of Christ is *inconsistent* with the phraseology of scripture." Let us see—it is said, Revelations, i: 5, "to him that has washed us from our sins in his own blood;"—"washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the

Lamb;" the "washing of regeneration," &c. Is immersion inconsistent with such phraseology? Let the dullest apprehension judge! Cowper says:

"There is a fountain filled with blood
Drawn from Immanuel's veins,
And sinners plunged beneath that flood
Lose all their guilty stains."

Cowper, obviously, did not see through Mr. R.'s optics.

Mr. R. quotes some instances, in which the word *sprinkle* occurs—but what, I ask, have those to do with *baptism*? He ought to have informed the common reader, that in the original, not one of those sprinklings are indicated by the word *baptism*. They are all *rantisms*. We know as well as Mr. R., that every mode of the motion of water is spoken of in the Bible. Pouring, sprinkling, flowing, running, springing up. We also read of drinking unto one spirit, of drinking the *blood* of the Son of man; why are not all these *modes* of baptism. My reply is, simply because there is no *baptism* in any one of them—no burial, and resurrection with our glorious Redeemer. Mr. R. has one argument left, which will weigh more with some souls than all his other arguments combined. It is as follows:—"Immersion in baptism involves a changing of dress, an attention to its sinking in the water, and a close clinging of saturated clothes to the person, from which delicacy shrinks."

This caricature is a low appeal to the *pride* of the human heart. Mr. R., and "*Punch in Canada*," may join hand in hand, in ridiculing Christ's ordinances, but that resurrection, so beautifully symbolized in baptism approaches, when the Lord will plead his own cause. Had I met with the above language in the writings of some low infidel, whose associations, when he "looketh on a woman" in the water, or out of the water, are eternally the same, it would not have surprised me; but from a minister of the gospel, it is *startling*. My reply to this argument, is as follows: "To the pure all things are pure; unto them that are defiled and unbelieving, nothing is pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled." How differently does Mrs. Sigourney speak of the baptism of a lovely young lady, she says,—

"Then with a firm unshrinking step,
The watery path she trod:
And gave, with woman's deathless trust,
Her being to her God.
And when, all drooping from the flood,
She rose like lilly's stem:
Methought that spotless brow might wear
An angel's diadem."

I have now examined Mr. R.'s arguments. I have met his difficulties one by one, and I now submit the whole to the friends of Christ, who must soon meet me before the great white throne, and I ask them to say, whether *truth* on this subject is with Mr. R. or myself. Every human being is accountable to God. He has given

us his word, and by that word we must all be judged. What then, are the teachings of the Bible on this subject? We learn that Christ commanded the baptism only of *believers* or *disciples*. The Apostles commanded Jews and Gentiles to *repent* and be baptised. They that *gladly received the word*, were baptised. They *hearing, believed*, and were baptised. They *believed* Philip preaching, and were *baptised*, both men and women. They believed with all their heart, and were baptised. It was a putting on of Christ, and the answer of a good conscience toward God. Again, baptism was performed in the River Jordan, and at Enon, because there was much water there, and we never read of the employment of a *cup* or basin. They went down into the water, were *buried* with Christ in baptism, and *raised again* in the likeness of his resurrection, they came up out of the water and went on their way rejoicing. In view of these simple Bible facts, together with the fact that infant sprinkling is not *once mentioned* in the word of God, I cannot resist the conviction that Pedobaptism is not according to the mind of the Redeemer—and that sprinkling is subversive of the Divine law.

NOTE.—A few unimportant typographical errors have been overlooked in the first part, such as—when, for where; these, for those; is, for are; and on page 11, eight lines from the bottom, received, for revealed.

en over-
r those;
ceived,